

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/752,431	BAER ET AL.	
	Examiner David C. Reese	Art Unit 3677	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) David C. Reese.

(3) Michael Tipps.

(2) Pat Burns.

(4) Primary Flemming Saether.

Date of Interview: 6/26/2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-3 and 5-9.

Identification of prior art discussed: Craven, Chen, Lindsey, DeHaire.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



ROBERT J. SANDY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Burns and Michael Tipps scheduled the interview to discuss the merits of the instant application. More specifically, Mr. Burns and Michael Tipps desired to discuss the submitted declaration from Mr. Tipps to the office and also what they considered the novel features of the instant invention; including how those features are different than those currently found saturated throughout the prior art. Mr. Burns and Michael Tipps stated that the combination of features that the invention possesses' are not obvious and would not perform as one would think when one combined similar features from the prior art. In conclusion, the examiner stated the applicant may want to focus more on amending the current listing of claims to include further limitations that better define the instant invention over that of the prior art including the possibility of claiming more in depth the critically of the three rings at the top of screw..